

REMARKS

The present application is U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/040,397. Claims 4-96 are pending in this application. Claim 7 is currently amended.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §102

Claims 4-12, 53-57, 59-62, 64-67 and 69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by D'Arlach et al. (US 6,026,433).

Regarding Independent Claim 4:

Claim 4 recites,

4. *(Previously Presented) A system for developing an application user interface, the system comprising:*
an integrated development environment configured for a developer to specify a user interface element in the application user interface, the user interface element having a user customizable property, the application user interface being configured as an interface between an internet application and a user;
an application designer configured to produce metadata characterizing the customizable property; and
a data repository including a data record associated with the customizable property, the data record being modifiable by a user of the internet application and accessible using the metadata.

With regard to Claim 4, the Examiner suggests that D'Arlach teaches a “user interface element having a user customizable property” (Column 4 lines 59-67). The Applicants traverse this statement.

D'Arlach does not teach an “*interface element having a user customizable property*” because the “user” of D'Arlach is not the “*user*” of Claim 4. Specifically, the “user” of D'Arlach is a user of the web site development system taught in D'Arlach, not an end-user of the generated web site. Thus, the “user” of D'Arlach is similar to the “*developer*” of Claim 4. This position is supported by numerous teachings within D'Arlach. For example, Figures 7-13 of

D'Arlach, which illustrate an interface for web site development according to col. 7 lines 58-60, are taught to illustrate a "user's display screen" according to the brief description of the drawings. Further, Figure 14 is taught to "illustrate an exemplary series of user actions in publishing a site," (Col. 3 lines 27-28). The steps shown in this figure involve publishing of a web site, see for example steps 1412-1418, not the use by and end user of an already a published web site. Further, at Col. 2 lines 47-49, D'Arlach teaches "[t]he new site is then customized according to a user's preference by editing the objects or elements. The customized site is then published as a new Web site." Here, the user must be a developer and cannot be an end user of the published web site because this language of D'Arlach teaches that the web site is "customized" before it is published.

In contrast, the "*user*" of Claim 4 is a user of the "*internet application*" accessed using a user customizable interface. For example, in Claim 4, the term "*user*" is used in the context of a "*user interface element*," an "*application user interface*," and "*between an internet application and a user*." Thus, "*user*" refers to a user of the "*internet application*" who accesses the "*internet application*" through the "*application user interface*." In this context, the "*user interface element having a user customizable property*" is a "*user interface element*" customizable by a user of the "*user interface*." Because the party referred to as a user in D'Arlach is not a user of an "*internet application*" accessed through a user customizable "*application user interface*," "*between an internet application and a user*," D'Arlach does not teach a "*user interface element having a user customizable property*."

Further, Claim 4 specifically refers to "*a developer*" that may specify the user interface element as distinct from a "*user*" who may use the "*user interface*" to access "*an internet application*." The party referred to in the text of D'Arlach cited by the Examiner appears to be

performing tasks that would be associated with this developer rather than a user. For example, the “*developer*” of Claim 4 “*speciff[ies] a user interface element.*” The Applicants are unable to find any teaching within D’Arlach that, once specified and published, an interface element has a further “*user customizable*” property as recited in Claim 4, the user being a user of the published web site. Therefore, it is again the position of the Applicants that D’Arlach does not teach a “*user interface element having a user customizable property.*”

Regarding Claims 5, 6 and 8:

The Applicants believe that Claims 5, 6, and 8 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to Claim 4 from which they depend.

Regarding Claim 7:

Claim 7 recites,

7. *(Currently Amended) The system of claim 4, wherein the integrated development environment is further configured to associate the user interface element with a procedure, within the internet application, the procedure configured to receive data entered by the user in a field of the user interface element.*

Claim 7 is currently amended to more particularly claim the invention. Support for this amendment is found, for example, on page 19 lines 4-5 of the specification as filed.

The Applicants believe that Claim 7 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 4, and further because D’Arlach does not teach communication of data through a customizable user interface element to an associated procedure of an internet application.

Regarding Independent Claim 9:

Claim 9 recites,

9. *(Previously Presented) A system for developing an application user interface, the system comprising:*

an integrated development environment configured for a developer to specify a user interface element in the application user interface, the user interface element having a user customizable property, the user customizable property being a response to a user input device, the application user interface being an interface between a user and an internet application;
a data repository including a data record configured to store a value characterizing the user customizable property, the value being user modifiable; and
an application designer configured to produce metadata for accessing the data record.

The Applicants believe that Claim 9 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 4.

Further, with regard to Claim 9, the Examiner suggests that “*the user customizable property being a response to a user input device,*” is “inherent in order to change a property a user must have some input device.” The Applicants agree that an input device may be used in D’Arlach but traverse the Examiner’s statement because the mere use of an input device does not teach a limitation of Claim 9 as suggested by the Examiner. Specifically, Claim 9 is not about whether a user makes some change using an input device. Rather, Claim 9 recites that “*a response to a user input device*” is itself the “*user customizable property.*” Thus, a user can customize how a “*user interface element*” will respond to a “*user input device.*” More specifically, one of the properties of a “*user interface element*” is how the “*user interface element*” responds to a user input device, and it is this property that is “*user customizable.*” The use of an input device to make a change in some other property does not teach these limitations. Thus, the use of an input device that the Examiner believes is inherent in D’Arlach does not teach “*the user customizable property being a response to a user input device,*” as recited in Claim 9.

D’Arlach does not appear to teach a “*user interface element*” that is “*user customizable*” as to how the “*user interface element*” responds to “*a user input device.*” Therefore, the

Applicants request that the Examiner point out this teaching in the cited art or allow Claim 9 and those claims that depend therefrom.

Regarding Claims 10 and 11:

The Applicants believe that Claims 10 and 11 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to Claim 4, and Claim 9 from which they depend.

Regarding Claim 12:

Claim 12 recites,

12. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 9, wherein the customizable property is further responsive to an identity of the user.

The Applicants believe that Claim 12 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 4, and Claim 9 from which it depends.

With regard to Claim 12 the Examiner states “D’Arlach discloses a system wherein the customizable property is further responsive to an identity of the user (Column 10 lines 40-45, 51-55).” The Applicants traverse this statement. The text cited by the Examiner relates to changing ownership of a web site, and adding, copying and deleting web pages from a web site. The cited language further supports the point that the “user” in the context of D’Arlach is not an end-user who would be using the web pages as an application interface to an internet application. Rather, the “user” of D’Arlach is a developer of the web site. In contrast, in Claim 12, the “*identity of the user*” is the identity of the user who is using the application interface to access an internet application. Thus, the text cited by the Examiner does not teach the limitations of Claim 12.

Further, the text cited by the Examiner teaches that ownership of a web site can be changed and that the web site can be modified, however, the Applicants are unable to identify any teaching that a “*user customizable property*” of a “*user interface element*” is responsive to this change in ownership. Specifically, D’Arlach does not appear to teach that a customizable

property would change responsive to a change in ownership. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner more specifically point out how D'Arlach teaches “*the customizable property is further responsive to an identity of the user,*” or allow Claim 12.

Regarding Claim 53

Claim 53 recites,

53. (Previously Presented) *A method of developing a user interface element, the method comprising the steps of:*
selecting a customizable property;
including the customizable property in the user interface element;
determining a data record for holding a value to characterize the customizable property,
the data record being stored in a data repository and being user modifiable, the
data repository being physically remote from a client used to display an HTML
based application user interface;
generating metadata further characterizing the customizable property, the metadata
including a reference to the data record; and
storing the metadata in association with the user interface element, the user interface
element being configurable for inclusion in the HTML based application user
interface.

The Applicants believe that Claim 53 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 4. Specifically, the “user” taught in D'Arlach is not the “*user*” of claim 53. Therefore, D'Arlach does not teach “*the data record being ... user modifiable,*” as recited in Claim 53.

Further, with regard to Claim 53, the Examiner cites Column 4 lines 59-64 of D'Arlach as teaching the claim limitations “*selecting a customizable property.*” This text teaches “[a] style template contains customizable objects or elements: buttons (i.e., graphics), text labels, and other elements. Each element in turn has attributes or properties associated with it.” Thus, the elements of D'Arlach would appear to have pre-associated attributes or properties within the style template. In contrast, Claim 53 recites a step where the developer makes an association between a specific customizable property and a user interface element. Specifically, Claim 53

recites “*selecting a customizable property*” and then “*including the customizable property in the user interface element.*” The Applicants are unable to identify any teaching of selecting a specific customizable property and then including the specific customized property in a user interface element. First, the teaching of D’Arlach appears to include selection on the basis of an entire style template and not on the basis of a single customizable property, e.g., “*selecting a customizable property.*” The Applicants are unable to identify in D’Arlach any teaching of selection on a property-by-property basis. There is an advantage to being able to select individual customizable properties rather than an entire style template. The Applicants, therefore, request that the Examiner point out teaching, within the cited art, of selection of “a customizable property,” on a property-by-property basis, or allow Claim 53. Second, the “*customizable property*” selected in Claim 53 is “*user modifiable.*” The Applicants are unable to identify any teaching in D’Arlach that style templates are “*user modifiable.*” The Applicants, therefore, request that the Examiner point out teaching that the style templates of D’Arlach are “*user modifiable,*” or allow Claim 53. Third, even if the selection of a style template were to be considered selection of an included customizable property, D’Arlach does not appear to teach “*including the customizable property in the user interface element.*” The Applicants, therefore, request that the Examiner point out teaching of “*selecting a [user] customizable property*” and then “*including the customizable property in the user interface element,*” as recited in Claim 53.

Regarding Claim 54:

The Applicants believe that Claim 54 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 53 from which it depends, as well as Claim 4.

Regarding Claim 55:

The Applicants believe that Claim 55 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 53 from which it depends, as well as Claim 4 and Claim 12.

Regarding Claim 56:

The Applicants believe that Claim 56 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 53 from which it depends.

Regarding Claim 57:

The Applicants believe that Claim 57 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 53 from which it depends, as well as Claim 4 and Claim 9.

Regarding Claim 59:

Claim 59 recites,

*59. (Previously Presented) A method of developing an application user interface associated with an internet application, the method comprising the steps of:
selecting a user customizable user interface element associated with a data record, the data record being stored in a data repository and being user modifiable, the data repository being physically remote from a client used to display the application user interface;
including the user customizable user interface element in the application user interface;
generating metadata characterizing the user customizable user interface element, the metadata including a reference to the data record; and
storing the metadata in association with the internet application, the internet application being configured for access using the application user interface.*

The Applicants believe that Claim 59 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 4, as well as Claim 53. Specifically, the “user” of D’Arlach is different than the “user” recited in Claim 55. Thus, D’Arlach does not teach “a user customizable user interface element” or a data record that is “user modifiable.”

Regarding Claim 60:

The Applicants believe that Claim 60 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 59 from which it depends, as well as Claim 12.

Regarding Claim 61:

The Applicants believe that Claim 61 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 59 from which it depends.

Regarding Claim 62:

The Applicants believe that Claim 62 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 59 from which it depends, as well as Claim 9.

Regarding Claim 64:

Claim 64 recites,

64. *(Previously Presented) A method of generating an application user interface, the method comprising the steps of:*
accessing a page definition, the page definition including metadata for defining a user customizable property of the application user interface;
obtaining a reference to a user modifiable data record, using the metadata;
accessing the user modifiable data record using the reference, the data record being stored in a data repository physically remote from a client used to display the customized application user interface;
reading the data record to determine a value characterizing the user customizable property;
generating markup-language responsive to the value; and
including the generated markup-language in the application user interface.

The Applicants believe that Claim 64 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 4, as well as Claim 53.

Specifically, with regard to Claim 64, the Examiner states “D’Arlach discloses ... accessing a page definition, the page definition including metadata for defining a user customizable property of the application user interface (Column lines 59-63) obtaining a reference to a user modifiable data record, using the metadata (Column 5 lines 14-16).” As

discussed above, the “user” referred to on Column 4 lines 59-63 and Column 5 lines 14-16 of D’Arlach is a user of a web site development system, not the “user” recited in Claim 64. It is, therefore, the position of the Applicants that the cited text does not teach the elements of Claim 64 that include “*a user customizable property*” or “*a user modifiable data record.*”

Regarding Claims 65, 66 and 69:

The Applicants believe that Claims 65, 66 and 69 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 64, from which they depend.

Regarding Claim 67:

The Applicants believe that Claim 67 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 64, from which it depends, and also Claim 9.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Applicants note that all of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are based in part on D’Arlach. Those comments made above with respect to Claims 4-12, 53-57, 59-62, 64-67 and 69, therefore, also apply to the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 22-35, 37, 42, 44-47, 49-52, 63, 68, 70, 72-76, 79, 80, 82-85, 87-91, 93-96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over D’Arlach in view of ResQNet (“ResQNet”, ResQNet.com announces the Release of ResQNet Version 3.2).

In response, the Applicants submit an Oath and Declaration and supporting evidence under 37 C.F.R. § 131 to claim priority over ResQNet. The supporting evidence includes a document entitled “PeopleSoft Power HTML Delivering Intuitive, Robust, Pure Internet Applications for the Power User.” The Examiner is directed to, for example, pages 6-8 of this document for a discussion of Tab-over.

Claims 15, 16, 36, 71, 77, 81, 86, and 92 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Arlach and ResQNet in view of Castro ("HTML for the World Wide Web with XHTMS and CSS: Visual QuickStart Guide, Fifth Edition.)

In response, the Applicants submit an Oath and Declaration and supporting evidence under 37 C.F.R. § 131 to claim priority over ResQNet.

Claims 19, 48, and 78 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Arlach and ResQNet in view of Carter (U.S. 6,549,199).

In response, the Applicants submit an Oath and Declaration and supporting evidence under 37 C.F.R. § 131 to claim priority over ResQNet.

Claims 21 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Arlach and ResQNet in view of Dutta (U.S. 2002/0097264).

In response, the Applicants submit an Oath and Declaration and supporting evidence under 37 C.F.R. § 131 to claim priority over ResQNet.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Amendment and to examine the pending claims. The Examiner is respectfully urged to consider the claimed invention at the earliest time possible and issue a favorable action indicating the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone Applicants' undersigned representative at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan Ballard et al.

Date: June 17, 2004

By: _____



Steven M. Colby, Ph.D.
Patent Attorney
Reg. No. 50,250
Carr & Ferrell LLP
2200 Geng Rd.
Palo Alto, CA 94303
Phone: (650) 812-3424
Fax: (650) 812-3444